

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Björn (US 6,714,222), hereafter referenced as Björn.

Regarding **claim 1**, Björn discloses Graphical User Interface for Communications. Björn specifically discloses *A multifunctional aspirating appliance* (GUI Based on a Refrigerator or other Kitchen appliance, col.13, line 27-32) for *household use, characterised in that it comprises, in the front part of its body (1), a multimedia apparatus (2) including a monitor (3) (inherent in GUI) as a terminal unit of interaction (inherent in GUI (Graphics User Interface)) with a plurality of devices* (television, radio, telephone, appliances, col.5, line 1-9) *useful when using the kitchen and managing the home* (Appliances Control, Phone Functions, and so on, Fig.5). However, Björn fails to disclose *A multifunctional aspirating hood*.

However, Björn discloses that GUI could be alternatively mounted on any other kitchen appliance (Col.13, line 28-48) and the mounting GUI on the hood would have been obvious try - choosing from a finite a number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success and one that the courts have already

established as obvious, KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S.-, 82 USPTQ2d 1385 (2007). .

Therefore, given this established legal conclusion and teaching of Björn, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Björn by mounting GUI on the hood, in order to do mount GUI on a appliance from a finite set of kitchen appliances. The Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, has all the features of claim 1.

Regarding **claim 2**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *Hood as claimed in claim 1, characterised in that said monitor (3) is provided with a touch screen (4)* (touch screen, col.5, line 14-15).

Regarding **claim 3**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *Hood as claimed in claim 1, characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal of a computer (22)* (Computer for running the GUI, col.13, line 39-48) *connected to a unit for commanding the general functions of the hood* (Computer for running application that can be accessed via GUI, col.13, line 39-48, Appliance Control, Fig.5).

Regarding **claim 4**, it is the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses that GUI function includes TV (TV at Fig.5).

Therefore, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Björn by specially *providing said monitor (3) is connected to antennas and cables of television network*, in order to

access TV. The Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, further incorporating antennas and cables of television network, has all the features of claim 4.

Regarding **claim 8**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *Hood as claimed in claim 1, characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal of a computer (22)* (computer 603 at Fig.6) connected to the Internet (internet, col.5, line 4-9) and to other telecommunications network (communication networks, col.13, line 49-52), *modem* (inherent in Communication module 609, Fig.6).

Regarding **claim 9**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal of a computer (22)* (computer 603 at Fig.6) connected to a micro-controller (processor 605, Fig.6) of energy consumption (inherent in processor).

Regarding **claim 10**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal of a computer (22)* (computer 603 at Fig.6) and it is provided with a device for voice commands (Voice recognition technology and command, col.6, line 31-36).

Regarding **claim 11**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *characterised in that on said monitor (3) is an initial standard display* (Fig.1 Main Page of GUI), divided into windows for the different sectors of interest (label of applications 107's, Fig.1).

Regarding **claim 14**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *charaeterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal*

*of a computer (22) provided with a reader (15) for DVD, DVR, CD ROM and floppy disk (inherent in computer 603, Fig.6).*

Regarding **claim 15**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal (Touch Screen 611, Fig.6) of a computer (22)* (computer 603 at Fig.6) *provided with a video camera (16)* (video camera 617, Fig.6).

Regarding **claim 16**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal (Touch Screen 611, Fig.6) of a computer (22)* (computer 603 at Fig.6) *provided with at least one speaker (10, 11) (Loud Speaker 615, Fig.6) and with a microphone (12)* (Microphone 613, Fig.6).

Regarding **claim 17**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal of a computer (22) connected to a series of sensors (21)* (sensor, col.12, line 15-21) *for analysing the environmental state* (detects an approaching user, col.12, line 15-21).

3. **Claims 5-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Björn in view of Tracy (US 6,163,257), hereafter referenced as Tracy.

Regarding **claim 5**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, as applied to claim 1, discloses *said monitor (3) is connected to phone* (Phone function, fig.5). However, it fails to disclose characterised in that said monitor (3) is connected to video telephone and video intercom apparatuses.

In the analogous field of endeavor, Tracy discloses Security System Having Event Detection and Keypads with Integral Monitor. Tracy specifically discloses *Video Phone* (Fig.1), in order to take alternative actions depending on the viewed images (col.3, line 51-61).

Therefore, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Björn by specially *providing* characterised in that said monitor (3) is connected to video telephone and video intercom (inherent in video telephone) apparatuses in order to take alternative actions depending on the viewed images. The Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, further incorporating the Tracy Video Phone, has all the features of claim 5.

Regarding **claim 6**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, further incorporating the Tracy Video Phone, as applied to claim 1 and 5, discloses characterised in that said monitor (3) is connected to video cameras (inherent in Tracy: Video Phone, for the surveillance purpose) for watching home accesses and areas occupied by persons requiring surveillance such as children (child entered the house alone, col.3, line 51-61), the elderly, persons who are not self-sufficient and visitors.

Regarding **claim 7**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim1). However, it fails to disclose characterised in that said monitor (3) is connected to alarm systems located in areas of interest of the home.

However, Tracy specifically discloses said monitor (3) is connected to alarm systems located in areas of interest of the home (alarm is reported from one or more

detectors, col.3, line 19-25), in order to do visual verification of false alarm (col.2, line 6-8).

Therefore, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Björn by specially *providing characterised in that said monitor (3) is connected to alarm systems located in areas of interest of the home*, in order to do visual verification of false alarm. The Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, further incorporating the Tracy Alarm system, has all the features of claim 7.

4. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Björn in view of Kim ( US 2001/0,053,963), hereafter referenced as Kim.

Regarding **claim 12**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). However, it fails to disclose *characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal of a computer (22) where diagnostic software is installed for automatically calling service personnel to repair failures and with other service centres.*

In the analogous field of endeavor, Kim discloses Refrigerator and Method for Controlling The Same. Kim specifically discloses *characterised in that said monitor (3) (Display unit 36, Fig.3) is the video terminal of a computer (22) (communication Unit 33, Fig.3) where a diagnostic software (Self-Checkup S42, Fig.4) is installed for automatically calling service personnel to repair failures and with other service centres*

(Contact to a Service Center S49, Fig. 4), in order to transmit automatically failure relation information to service center (paragraph 2).

Therefore, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Björn by specially *providing characterised in that said monitor (3) is the video terminal of a computer (22) where a diagnostic software is installed for automatically calling service personnel to repair failures and with other service centres*, in order to take transmit automatically failure relation information to service center. The Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, further incorporating the Kim self-checkup and transmitting failure information to service center, has all the features of claim 12.

5. **Claim 13** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Björn in view of Hinzpeter ( US 6,370,021), hereafter referenced as Hinzpeter.

Regarding **claim 13**, the Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). However, it fails to disclose characterised in that said monitor (3) is a lectern monitor with adjustable inclination through a support (5) with ball joint.

In the analogous field of endeavor, Hinzpeter discloses Operating Stand for a Tablet Press Device. Hinzpeter specifically discloses characterised in that said monitor (3) is a lectern monitor (Lectern, col.1, line 51-54, Touch Screen 18, Fig. 1), in order to permit an individual adjustment adapted to the operation (col.1, line 31-33).

Therefore, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Björn by specially *providing* characterised in that said monitor (3) is a lectern monitor with adjustable inclination through a support (5) with ball joint, in order to permit an individual adjustment adapted to the operation. The Björn GUI, incorporating mounting GUI on hood, further incorporating the Hinzpeter lectern monitor with adjustable inclination through a support with ball joint , has all the features of claim 13.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEE-YONG KIM whose telephone number is (571)270-3669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:00am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HEE-YONG KIM/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Andy S. Rao/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621  
March 26, 2010